

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13, 14, 31, 32, 34, 35, and 40 are as previously presented, and claims 33 and 36 are as originally filed. Claims 7, 12, and 15-30 were previously canceled, and claims 37 and 38 are currently canceled. Claim 39 was amended to convert it into an independent form and to incorporate the limitations from the preceding claim. No new matter was introduced with these amendments.

With these amendments, claims 1-6, 8-11, 13, 14, 31-36, 39 and 40 are pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being unpatentable over numerous references.

The Office maintained the 102(b) rejection in view of **Kampe** (US 4859670), **Howe** (J. Med. Chem., 1972, 15(10), 1040-1045), and **Seiler** (EP 0136976). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not anticipated with respect to these references for the reasons previously stated on the record. Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone call on July 1, 2011, informing the Applicants that the rejections in view of these references were withdrawn.

The Office also rejected claims 37 and 38 in view of **Falch** (J. Med. Chem., 1968, 11(3), 608-611) citing composition comprising compound with Registration No. 17173-99-8. In response, Applicants canceled claims 37 and 38, thereby obviating rejection in view of Falch.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13, 14, and 31-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over several references. Applicants respectfully disagree for the following reasons:

The Office maintained the 103(a) rejection in view of **Kampe** (US 4859670), **Fujikawa** (US5026708), **Howe** (J. Med. Chem., 1972, 15(10), 1040-1045), and **Seiler** (EP 0136976). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are not rendered obvious by these references for

the reasons of record. Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone call on July 1, 2011, informing the Applicants that the rejections in view of these references were withdrawn.

In addition, the Office issued new rejections of claims 37-39 in view of **Falch** (J. Med. Chem., 1968, 11(3), 608-611) asserting that the claimed compounds are alkyl homologs and/or position isomers of the cited compound and thus obvious to the skilled chemist for the same utility. Applicants have canceled claims 37 and 38. With respect to the rejections of claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that anthranilic acid derivative of Falch is not expected to have similar properties to those compounds claimed. In other words, a person of skill in the art would not be motivated to modify this compound to arrive to the presently claimed matter based on the teaching of Falch.

In addition, the present application includes biological activity data of the claimed compositions in Figures 1A-1O that demonstrate the activity in Gal4-chimera-reporter gene assay. These results indicate that the claimed compositions show significant activity in this assay. Figures 2, 3, 4A and 4B disclose additional biological activity. For example, Figures 4A and 4B show that the claimed compositions are able to selectively activate Nurr1/RXR heterodimers but have minimal ability to directly activate RXR. The prior art does not teach that the compounds disclosed therein have activity in Gal4-chimera-reporter gene assay or that they are able to selectively activate Nurr1/RXR heterodimers. There is nothing in the prior art that would make obvious to one of skill in the art that the compounds of the prior art could or should be modified in a manner that results in the compounds recited in the present claims or that such compounds would have activity in the Gal4-chimera-reporter gene assay. Because a compound and all of its properties are one, the present claims, therefore, cannot be obvious. *In re Papesch*, 315 F.2d 381, 391, 137 USPQ 43, 51 (CCPA 1963) (“From the standpoint of patent law, a compound and all its properties are inseparable.”).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In light of the all above arguments, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes it to be helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative by telephone at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 1, 2011

/Jelena Janjic Libby/
Jelena Janjic Libby
Registration No. 64,347

Telephone: 312-913-0001
Facsimile: 312-913-0002

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606